

**NEVADA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
NEVADA STATE BOARD FOR CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION**

Thursday, September 3, 2015

Department of Education
700 East Fifth Street
Board Conference Room
Carson City, Nevada

And

Department of Education
9890 South Maryland
Board Conference Room
Las Vegas, Nevada

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
(Video Conferenced)

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

In Las Vegas:

Elaine Wynn
Dave Jensen
Anthony Martinez
Mark Newburn
Allison Serafin
Victor Wakefield

In Carson City:

Kevin Melcher
Freeman Holbrook
Teri Jamin
Dave Cook

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

In Las Vegas

Dena Durish, Deputy Superintendent, Educator Effectiveness & Family Engagement
Karl Wilson, Education Programs Professional
Laurie Hamilton, Administrative Assistant

In Carson City

Steve Canavero, Deputy Superintendent, Student Achievement
Janie Lowe, Director, Education Programs
Blakeley Hume, Education Programs Professional
Katherine Rohrer, Education Programs Professional
Tracy Gruber, Education Programs Professional
Russ Keglovits, Education Programs Professional

Diane Mugford, Education Programs Supervisor
Peter Zutz, Director, Assessment, Data and Accountability
Leslie James, Education Programs Program
Dave Brancamp, Director, Office of Standards and Instructional Support
Tom MacDiarmid, Education Programs Professional
Judy Osgood, Public Information Officer
Joyce Hilley, Educator Licensure Analyst
Lauren Hulse, Management Analyst
Shawn Osborne, IT Department
Karen Johansen, Assistant to the State Board of Education

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT:

In Carson City:

Greg Ott, Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

In Las Vegas:

Roseanne Richards, Clark County School District
Dale Norton, Superintendent, Nye County School District
Jeff Zander, Superintendent, Elko County School District
Bob Dolezal, Superintendent, White Pine School District
Brian Myli, Public Education Foundation
Josh Keating, Public Education Foundation
Ben Gerhardt, Nevada Virtual Academy
Andrea Klafter-Rakita, Assistant Chief Student Achievement Officer, Clark County School District
Jenn Blackhurst, HOPE
Victoria Carreon, Guinn Center
Jason Lamberth
Kellie Ballard, Clark County School District
Seth Rau, Nevada Succeeds
Stephen Augspurger, Clark County Association of School Administrators
Spenser Stewart, WGU, Nevada Switch
Pat Skorkowsky, Superintendent Clark County School District
Heidi Arbuckle, Clark County School District
Dana Janson, Clark County School District
Denise Thistlewaite, Clark County School District
Brenda Pearson, Clark County Education Association
Russell Fecht, Superintendent, Pershing County School District
Deb Hegna, Clark County School District
Beth Rubins, Las Vegas PBS
Michael Robison, University of Phoenix
Sylvia Lazos, Latino Leadership Council
Caroline McIntosh, Nevada Virtual Academy
Kipp Ortenberger, Las Vegas PBS
David Blodgett, Public Education Foundation
Anna Antolick, HOPE

Nick Sarisahin, Coral Academy
Steve Hansen, Superintendent, Lincoln County School District
Punam Mathur
Walt Hackford, Superintendent, Mineral County School District
Ryan Reeves, Academica
Sandra Sheldon, Superintendent, Churchill County School District
Betsy Giles, Clark County Education Association
Rodriguez Broadnax, Interim Superintendent, Esmeralda County School District
Susan Ortega, Lander County School District
Susannah Buckley, Clark County School District
Zach Stork, Clark County School District
Adam Johnson, Teach For America
Jhone Ebert, Clark County School District
Nicole Rourke, Clark County School District
Wm Rob Roberts, Nevada Association School Administrators
Denette Corrales, Wells Fargo
Greg Wineman, Superintendent, Eureka County School District
Demetria Murphy, Teach For America
Marilyn Dondero Loop

Carson City:

Kristen McNeill, Washoe County School District
Kirsten Gleissner, Northwest Nevada Regional Professional Development Program
Sandra Aird, Washoe County School District
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of State Superintendents
Todd Butterworth, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Allison Combs, Nevada System of Higher Education
Scott Bailey, Washoe County School District
Dawn Huckaby, Washoe County School District
Jill Manitt, UNR Social Work

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. with attendance as reflected above.

Public Comment #1

Lindsay Anderson, Washoe County School District (WSCD), commented on the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF). Recently WSCD received information and recommendations from the Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) regarding changing the weights to an 80/20 percentage. She expressed concern about the change and how the scoring of the matrix is impacted by changing the weights. Ms. Anderson asked to consider deferring adoption of the weighted matrix to allow further consideration of the impact.

Sylvia Lazos, Latino Leadership Council, commented on school plans for zoom schools. She said it is helpful the plans are accessible to all members of the public even though they are complicated. Ms. Lazos stressed the reading skills development centers are very important in the zoom school plans. Reviewing these by a third party is important going into the third year to assure the methodologies used in both WSCD and CCSD are those that will work and produce results.

President Wynn announced the requested updates from CCSD and WCSD on the recruitment and retention of teachers has been deferred to the October meeting.

Approval of Flexible Agenda

Member Serafin moved to approve a flexible agenda. Member Newburn seconded the motion. The motion carried.

President's Report

President Wynn welcomed two new board members. Dave Jensen, superintendent, Humboldt County School District represents the Nevada Association of School Superintendents and Anthony Martinez is the new student representative.

President Wynn announced that Superintendent Erquiaga has been asked to join the Governor's staff as the chief strategy officer and his last day as the superintendent of public instruction will be September 4, 2014. He will continue to focus on education and workforce development in his new position.

Deputy Superintendent Steve Canavero will serve as the interim superintendent of public instruction during the transition and Janie Lowe will serve as the deputy superintendent. President Wynn re-capped some of the achievements made during the past two years with Superintendent Erquiaga at the Department of Education (NDE).

Superintendent's Report

Superintendent Erquiaga conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation providing an overview of the past two years as the state superintendent, including adopting regulations, testing issues and committing to the Common Core Standards. A lot of work was about the vision, mission priorities and aligning the NDE along functional areas. The perception of the NDE has changed with new focus on outcomes. Zoom schools have been introduced to help Nevada's English learners (ELs) and the needs to help underperforming students in the state are being addressed. Many federal issues have been dealt with including the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) waiver. The notion of a New Nevada includes almost \$1 billion to be invested in Pre-K through higher education with a system of many legislation pieces recently passed.

Superintendent Erquiaga said there are three areas ahead, implementation, evaluation and addressing chronic under performance and college and career readiness. The Board will spend much of the next two years on these three topic areas. He cautioned that work will need to be done in earnest for the next 18 months on the statewide system of accountability. There are tremendous challenges with data as a result of what happened with testing this spring. Focus on assessments needs to continue, and there have been many discussions about testing over the last two years. There is still no cohesive strategy for assessments in public schools in Nevada. There is a collection of laws and requirements but they are not aligned.

Nevada law requires final revisions are made to the Nevada Plan for school finance. The plan was written in 1967 and this year the legislature processed a bill to revise the plan with a new formula. Superintendent Erquiaga further discussed chronic underperformance and college and career readiness. In about six weeks the report card given to schools about the school

performance work must be issued. Scores from previous years are being carried over because of data shifting with the new Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) test. This is not because of the data challenge with computers, but because there is a new base line.

Approval of Consent Agenda

a. Possible Approval of:

- Re-licensing of a Clark County Private School for a four-year period: Kids Campus Learning Center – Martin Luther King Boulevard
- Re-licensing of a Clark County Private School for a two-year period: D.H's Christian Academy
- Re-licensing of a Lyon County Private School for a two-year period: A Step Ahead
- Licensing of a new Washoe County Private School for a two-year period: Sterling Academy.

b. Possible Approval of Textbook/Instructional Committee findings from Eureka County School District

c. Possible Approval of the awarding of special education discretionary units to the following school districts and charter school authority for instructional programs during the 2015-16 year, as recommended by staff.

d. Possible Approval of July 23 SBE Minutes

e. Possible Approval of two new members to the Title I Committee of Practitioners to advise the State Education Agency on issues related to policies affecting children who are disadvantaged

- Karen Chessell, EPP for Family & Consumer Sciences, Nevada Department of Education
- Brian Prewett, Director, Title 1, Washoe County School District

Member Serafin moved to approve the consent agenda. Member Newburn seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action of awarding Great Teaching and Leading Fund grants (S.B. 474) of up to \$4.9 million in School Year 2015-16 for professional development in science standards; implementation of the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF); recruitment, selection and retention of effective teachers/principals; and programs of leadership training and development.

Deputy Superintendent Durish informed the Board this is the first time in Nevada that the Board and the NDE have played a role in the development of educators. A [PowerPoint](#) presentation was conducted providing an overview of the purpose, funding and administration, reporting and evaluation and the priorities, timeline and process over the next biennium for the Great Teaching and Leading Fund (GTLF). An advisory task force will begin meeting later this month and will provide recommendations about statewide professional development to the Legislature.

Deputy Durish provided information about the entities that submitted applications for the GTLF funds. She explained this year is the implementation, evaluation and accountability of the program and built into the bill are two structures for evaluation and reporting. This funding for the GTLF came with a position, and there is a newly created position within the division of

Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement. That staff person will begin after October 1, 2015.

The bill specifies priorities for which grants of money may be made from the GTLF for Fiscal Year 2015-2016 and they have been identified to include instruction in Science standards, implementation of the statewide performance evaluation system, and focus on recruitment selection and retention training. The priorities are subject to change. The bill did not specify how much money was to go to each of the priorities.

The intent is to have the Program Effectiveness Report to the Board the end of October followed by the independent evaluation of grant funds to be awarded by December. Beginning with fiscal year 2016-17, on or before September 30 of each year, the Board is to prescribe the priorities for which grants of money may be awarded from the GTLF. The program staff person will coordinate with the regional training program bodies for their priorities to assist in setting them for the upcoming year.

A review team representing teachers, administrators and education leaders was formed and met August 19 and 20, 2015. The group reviewed the 24 applications submitted and their recommendations have been provided. President Wynn requested that the two members from the review committee who were present share their impressions of the review team.

Seth Rau, policy director, Nevada Succeeds, stated the shortest application of the 24 submitted was 20 pages, the longest 86 pages. Committee members poured through the applications and used a rubric to determine whether the applications aligned with the intent of the law. Applications that were not aligned were dismissed. Discussions were held about which programs would have the most impact on teachers and leaders in Nevada. Four goals were set by the legislature to assure science standards, the NEPF, increasing teacher pipeline recruitment and addressing leadership in the state were implemented.

Marilyn Dondero Loop shared that there was vigorous discussion over two days about awarding the money, the intent of the law and which programs to implement.

Deputy Durish provided a [spreadsheet](#) with details about the GTLF review team recommendations to fund or not to fund the applications.

President Wynn asked if the new Spending and Government Efficiency Commission for the system of K-12 (SAGE) will have oversight of the expenditure of funds, and would they review this distribution. Superintendent Erquiaga explained SAGE is the commission to study public education in Nevada. The charge of that body is to look for efficiencies in educational spending and to make recommendations for possible improvements but they have not yet met.

President Wynn noted the review team is the first group that has been charged with approving this distribution of money. She inquired whether recommendations were made for the next series of evaluations to help fine tune the process when the new staff person is in place. She also inquired if there will be enough accountability to refine and improve the criteria.

Ms. Dondero Loop affirmed those discussions were held over the two day period. The intent of the bill was revisited many times as they considered what the intent was and how can the application be clearer? There were some applications that might have been good, but they did not meet all the intent of the bill.

Superintendent Erquiaga added as priorities are set going into the next round, what the Regional Development Professional Programs (RPDPs) established through their assessment will be considered. He advised that less is more, and to be very targeted and clearer than in the bill and to not consider as many categories. There were applications for a little of this and a little of that. The clearer about what the needs of the system will be in school year 2016-17, the easier the process will be.

Member Wakefield said he looks forward to working through the priority setting but would recuse himself from discussions and voting because his employer is an applicant for the grant.

Member Newburn commented that the make-up of the review committee was good, but he was surprised the committee that granted \$2 million for science professional development did not include a representative from the science or STEM community. He expressed concerns about the outcomes. Under the award only one charter school and no traditional public schools in the southern half of the state will receive professional development money for science. In general, it appears there was about \$1 million of science professional development funds for southern Nevada that were not granted. The need for professional development in science is still there and he asked if the funds will be there next year when the priorities are set.

President Wynn asked if there was an outreach to the STEM coalition for their participation on the committee. Deputy Durish appreciated member Newburn's comments adding they were looking for people impacted by the results of the training and people that were familiar with effective high quality professional development. She debated several times about how to organize the committee and apologized there was not a person with a science background on the team.

Ms. Dondero Loop commented as a member of the committee she represented all entities. She did not think she needed a science background, although she has a teaching background, because she was fair when reviewing the applications, including charter schools. She took the task of ushering all entities, not having a focus or a favorite, but doing what was right for the state.

Member Melcher commented whenever there is new legislation it is difficult to interpret it and then design the implementation. As a Board, it is important to respect the work of the committee. He said he cannot make a motion, but recommended approval.

Member Serafin expressed concerns about the process and setting a standard for what is expected. She had difficulty understanding the recommendations of the committee as she read the 34 applications because it was unknown how the applications were scored. Not having a scored rubric for each application, there was no clarity about the process. Member Serafin expressed discomfort in supporting the recommendations feeling responsible to obtain information about how the decisions were made.

Mr. Rau appreciated member Serafin's comments adding was the first time for the process and Deputy Durish did an admirable job of creating a rubric, however first efforts are rarely perfect. Moving forward adjustments will be made to the rubric. The rubric captured most of the work, but there were additional factors.

President Wynn acknowledged her perspective as a business person is different than Member Serafin's who was a former teacher. She believes in assigning directives to staff and teams of citizens to do the research. She stated it would be helpful and instructive to have the background research available for board members, however it will not prevent her from making a decision today based on this discussion.

Member Cook moved to approve the Great Teaching and Leading Fund reviews team recommendation for funding. Member Newburn seconded the motion. Member Serafin voted nay. Member Wakefield abstained. Member Holmes-Sutton was absent. Members Cook, Holbrook, Wynn and Newburn voted yea. The motion carried.

Information, Discussion and Possible Approval of Scoring Ranges for Nevada Educator Performance Framework Educational Practice Category and Application for Alternate Evaluation System/Tools.

Deputy Durish provided background on A.B. 447 that impacted the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) implementation. The Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) makes recommendations to the Board for approval. In addition, the Board is required to adopt policies and programs for the establishment of a system, which has 4 rating levels defined by statute. Each teacher and building level administrator in the state will have one of four ratings; highly effective, effective, minimally effective or ineffective. The Board will include criteria for making those designations. The focus today is on educational practices that include two components that make up the educational practice score.

Dr. Pam Salazar, chair, Teachers and Leaders Council provided a [PowerPoint](#) presentation regarding the range of scores that will identify the final summative rating that defines the ratings for both administrators and teachers. She summarized the process for setting the range of scores on a scale of 1 to 4.

- Highly Effective 3.60 – 4
- Effective 2.80 – 3.59
- Minimally Effective 1.91 - 2.79
- Ineffective 1.0 – 1.90

Examples of the rating system were based on recommendations from the TLC. The system will continually be reviewed over time by the TLC and recommendations will be provided annually to the Board.

Member Serafin asked if the school districts would like to comment on the decision today. Dr. Salazar responded to a reference made earlier from WCSD regarding the weightings for instruction and professional responsibilities stating that is not part of the decision today. Those concerns will be discussed later during a regulatory workshop. Deputy Durish explained the determination today is regarding the summative scoring cutting points. This number will only occur at the end of the academic school year.

Lindsay Anderson, WCSD, clarified earlier comments were made in regards to the range. The WCSD has a board trustee on the TLC who opposed the recommendation of the ranges however Ms. Anderson is not encouraging the Board to take a position for or against.

Member Serafin moved to approve the recommended score range. Member Newburn seconded the motion. Member Cook and Member Holbrook voted nay. The motion carried.

Ms. Durish informed the Board the second part of the item is regarding the application. Nevada law specifies a school district may apply to use a Performance Evaluation System and tools that are different than those prescribed in the NEPF. *The application must be in the form prescribed by the State Board and must include, without limitation, a description of the evaluation system and tools proposed to be used by the school district. The State Board may approve use of the proposed evaluation system and tools if it determines that the proposed evaluation system and tools apply standards and indicators that are equivalent to those prescribed by the State Board.* If the Board is going to approve an alternative system, it is incumbent on the Board to approve a form that applicants will use to demonstrate equivalent to those prescribed by the State Board. Deputy Durish provided information about the form.

Member Wakefield moved to approve the form for districts to submit their applications. Member Serafin seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action concerning the minimum number of school days that must take place before certain examinations may be administered and the period during which they are to be administered.

Deputy Canavero informed the Board that S. B. 75 requires the State Board to establish the minimum number of instruction days prior to the assessment. The assessments are for the Criterion References Tests (CRT) in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 through 8. When the testing window is established it is uniformly applied across the state. One of the issues that came up during the legislative session is that the window does not work well for multi-track districts and different calendar configurations.

The minimum instruction days were set at 120 days, which is consistent with the SBACs policy that 66 percent of the instructional calendar be complete prior to the administration of the assessment. The constraints are presented in the [table](#) provided. He explained the process used by the NDE and CCSD staff to determine the dates. The recommendation for the Board is to approve 120 days as the minimum number of instructional days that must pass prior to the assessment window.

Member Serafin moved to approve 120 days as the minimum number of school days from to the administration of the assessments. Member Wakefield seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information and Discussion concerning the state assessment contract, the transition from Measured Progress to CTB/McGraw Hill, and an update on state readiness to administer the Smarter Balanced Assessment in Spring 2016.

Deputy Canavero introduced a new member of the team, Peter Zutz, recently hired as the administrator for the Office of Assessment, Data and Accountability Management.

An overview was provided for the Board. The Board has been involved in discussions related to SBAC and Measured Progress (MP) and the roll out of the assessment last year. Subsequently, an RFP was initiated for a new vendor In January before the challenges in the assessment occurred. Every four to five years the NDE goes through the purchasing procedure to re-contract with vendors. There are two components to delivering the SBAC, the agreement with the Smarter Balanced assessment consortium, similar to an HOA, an inter-local agreement, as well as a contract with Measured Progress. That contract is now with DRC. The original awardee of the contract was CTB, McGraw Hill and subsequent to that DRC purchased CTB. There have been many activities related to wrapping up the former contract with MP that finalizes the administration of the CRT. An aspect of good news is that a settlement was reached with MP. The Nevada Attorney General's office issued a press release about the pre-litigation settlement. This concludes the ongoing negotiations related to the breach of contract. A resolution with SBAC is ongoing. Administrator Zutz and his team have been managing the transition with MP, and from MP to DRC, transitioning from a vendor that has been serving the state for about ten years to a new vendor with a sense of urgency. The HSPE sunsets and must be delivered in October.

There are still no scores for students who took the SBAC in English language arts and/or math last year. It was anticipated the scores would be received mid-August, and that has been changed to the end of August however the scores have still not been received. Administrator Zutz discussed the various aspects of the SBAC settlement. An important question to consider is to what extent did the technology challenges affect the validity and reliability of student scores? Also, an impact study that will help understand what those scores mean has not been received yet. Information is being sent to the school districts to communicate with parents and constituents to answer questions about when the scores will be available and what they mean. Deputy Canavero said continuing updates will be provided at future board meeting about Nevada's readiness to deliver computer adaptive tests in the spring.

Member Holbrook asked about the end-of-course timeframe and scores. Deputy Canavero responded the score reports should be available around January will be brought to the board for discussion.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action with school district representatives concerning administration of school year 2015-16 ACT test pursuant to NRS 389.807.

Member Jensen explained today he is representing the Nevada Association of State Superintendents (NASS) as president, and also as the superintendent of Humboldt County School District. The superintendents will share measures and processes that are being implemented within their districts to address the issue of the ACT performance. The Board is aware that the 2014-15 school year was the first broad based administration of the ACT to all 11th graders. The overall composite score for district averages led to a discussion with the school superintendents at NASS last month. At that time most of the districts had not received their materials yet and were unable to have a discussion. The superintendents were asked to review their individual data and then begin to solicit comments and thoughts to bring to the Board for a discussion on remediation and address the performance in this group.

In reviewing collected information, individual districts began to reflect and compile questions including how to quickly identify students that require remediation. As ACT demonstrated scores or thresholds for college readiness, those are being used as the basis.

Crystal Abba, Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) made a presentation to the superintendents group and introduced NROC, which is an extension of Education Ready. The NSHE purchased rights for all 11th and 12th graders. The math component was reviewed and is a measure that can be used as a remediation component, now available to all districts. Awareness is being enhanced about the importance of the ACT test and assuring students, staff and the community know the value and potential impact. There have been students who did not think they were college material, and as a result of their ACT performance are now rethinking that. Implementing 12th grade conditions were also discussed. If a student has obtained all their credits and met their proficiency requirements, the ability to not attend an entire school day is available in most districts. Research indicates that is not the most advantageous scheduling. Last, there is an enhanced focus on core instruction.

Pat Skorkowsky, superintendent, Clark County School District (CCSD) said this is an important time to move district goals of college and career readiness forward. The senior year needs to be about remediation or acceleration, not hibernation. College and career centers are being expanded in CCSD to catch students in high school and provide options to graduate high school. Messaging why it is important to take the ACT test is essential to help prepare for the next step and assuring rigor is there for the freshman and sophomore year so when students become juniors they are prepared for the assessment. Superintendent Skorkowsky said business partners have commented they get students as interviewees and they do not know how to write a resume, fill out applications or interview for a job. It is possible there needs to be a senior seminar about financial literacy and job preparation skills for students who do not meet the minimum requirements of an ACT and need to learn how to navigate in an adult world. Taking the ACT is a rite of passage and it is important students understand it is not just for certain kids, it is for every student and can open opportunities for students to be successful. Remediation programs will be put in place and WorkKey goals will be set up to help identify student needs.

Traci Davis, superintendent, Washoe County School District (WCSD) expressed excitement about their partnership with higher education at UNR and TMCC and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for sharing data. Sharing data allows insight about what is occurring with remediation. There is an opportunity to build additional high school prep initiatives to ensure students are receiving interventions as needed. It is a good continuum with higher education so it is fluid with K-12 as students move forward to a pre K-16 institution. There are data nights at the Boys and Girls club and also at local churches for parents to bring in data profile sheets to analyze where their kids are on the spectrum to graduate. Mentors are provided for kids in the community. It is a challenge with some kids who think the tests are not meaningful because they do not think they are going to college.

Wayne Workman, superintendent, Lyon County School District, stated a few years ago their board of trustees voted to adopt the battery of assessments that ACT offered, now called the Aspire. That test has been administered to students over the past few years and has been an excellent data point to use in conjunction with other assessments on how to guide instruction. Each of those years of administration has seen an increase of the composite score on the ACT which shows the teachers and administrators are cognizant of the exam and standards that must

be achieved. In addition, they have students who have gone to college because they took the ACT where they otherwise would not have. He thanked the Board for adopting the ACT because he has students that prove it changes lives.

Member Jensen said the superintendents have a few suggestions. They discussed going to phase two of Nevada Ready which may be a strong awareness campaign and could encompass the ACT as they reach out to students, parents and the community to help understand how vitally important the ACT measure is. In addition, another suggestion is to re-convene the Graduation Sub-Committee to discuss expectations for seniors and graduation. It is a pivotal time for that discussion. Relative to the ACT, as a collective group of superintendents they fully support the ACT and think it is an important measure for college readiness. He emphasized the superintendents representing all 17 counties and the Charter School Authority are eager to engage in the discussion. They take pride of what happens in their districts and the state.

Member Serafin said in relation to career readiness, employers want an employee that has reading, writing and logic skills that are demonstrated on the ACT. She would like to ensure that career readiness is an expectation of college readiness.

Student Representative Martinez stated he appreciated the discussion about awareness for students. He said seniors are not studying in their textbooks, rather they are online. Some students do not know how to fill out forms, or how to put together a resume and providing tools to help would be beneficial. He commented that most juniors did not know why they were taking the ACT. Some students studied for the test and some did not. The test results all of a sudden hit students with the awareness that they would be going to college in a year. When students learned where they were ranked from taking the test, they wanted to go above and beyond. Creating awareness for students that are not honor or AP students will help them to achieve. Students want to be ready for life.

Member Wakefield observed the NDE is engaged in a new review of the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF) and there could be value to include the ACT aggregate score by school in the NSPF. Member Jensen responded that the composite score could be dangerous especially when considering the lowest performing schools. The bench marks are more important and what is being done to improve performance. He recommended not considering the composite but to measure what is expected of all schools, which is growth.

Ms. Davis, said in WCSSD there is concern about the composite score, but there are other indicators that show growth is being made and meeting criteria to assure kids are ready for college and career.

Mr. Skorkowsky said that measuring the metric of growth is a more suitable measure as opposed to a composite score. Their growth has increased every year, although the figures are small.

President Wynn extended an invitation for the superintendents as an association to address this topic and provide recommendations the NDE can incorporate into the work being done with testing.

Member Jamin said part of the reason the Board selected the ACT was because of the WorkKeys component, which is related to career readiness. She asked whether the ACT Aspire includes career readiness, stating it is important not to add another test.

Deputy Canavero said a pilot for the WorkKeys program was made available, but there was little interest to use them in addition to the ACT core with the writing, which the Board approved. Correlations have been made with students who have taken the ACT WorkKeys. After administration students receive their WorkKey score and level. It provides additional job assessment information for students and families.

Information and Discussion regarding zoom Schools and the establishment of zoom School performance levels pursuant to S.B. 405 from the 78th Regular Legislative Session.

Karl Wilson, education programs professional, provided the Board with updates about the report that was submitted to the Board and LCB on August 17. He discussed the changes in S.B.504 that have been in place for the last two year and explained the Board is required to provide direction with proposals for performance levels and outcome indicators related to S.B. 405. Statute specifies the timeline of collecting and submitting data. The process includes requesting districts submit through the state's consolidated application process the plan for the district and school to be uploaded into the system.

Mr. Wilson discussed details in the S.B. 405 zoom School Funding and [Program Report](#). The two year investment of \$50 million was doubled over the next two years and will be \$100 million to support zoom schools and English learners (EL). This year zoom schools have increased in both CCSD and WCSD. Zoom schools will now provide additional programs and services beyond the four core programs. Full day kindergarten programs will expand and reading centers will become operational. A significant expansion includes the move into secondary schools.

The zoom secondary schools are not required to implement all programs outlined in statute, but are allowed to choose one or more of those services. There is a limit of two percent of the funds that can be spent for professional development, incentives for recruitment retention and family engagement.

Member Wakefield asked for clarification because there seems to be two concepts at the same time. One is the additional ability to spend in creative ways, but then any additional categories can only spend two percent of the funds. Mr. Wilson responded the elementary zoom schools were given authority to use some of the zoom school funding for professional development incentives for recruitment, retention and family engagement, and the two percent cap in law means they can think about it but they must find other sources of funding. This is one area where the zoom legislation is different than the Victory School legislation which did not set a two percent cap.

Mr. Wilson explained statute specifies *the Board shall prescribe statewide performance levels and outcome indicators to measure the effectiveness of the programs and services for which money is received by the school district and charter schools as part of this*. The recommendations today are provided for though and will be brought back in November for further discussion and possible action. Performance levels and outcome indicators must measure

how well schools are doing with the development of EL proficiency and academic performance. The performance levels and outcome indicators to be developed by the Board will become part of a criteria through which the state will notify schools if they are not implementing the programs and services as agreed upon, or if their performance is below the state expectation.

Mr. Wilson provided recommendations for the Board to consider. Representatives from CCSD and WCSD would like to provide input in the process and ensure the unique nature of zoom schools is understood. Many EL students are highly mobile attending up to 2-3 schools within a given school year which has an impact on how students learn and how accountability is measured. As the Board establishes the performance levels this will be an ideal time to align state priorities with informing federal accountability in the same areas. For years there have been specific requirements under the heading of Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMOA). For EL there are three focused on:

1. Increasing English proficiency
2. Attaining English proficiency
3. Achieving academic success

It is important to measure growth which would account for where students start in EL with their academic performance and then measure the impact of the school and instructional processes. The Board is encouraged to view that as a significant way to consider accountability for zoom schools. Mr. Wilson said often times the evaluations are based only on students who currently are EL and encouraged not to overlook those EL students already in the education system who achieved success. He suggested the Board view data for all current and former EL students

There is opportunity to look at the 34 states that are part of the World-class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) consortium to compare Nevada students with EL students from other states. Considerations include the best way to report and compare data. What is the intended outcome from the Board in terms of performance and outcome indicators? Is it accountability or ensuring the measures encourage improvement? If it is taken into account where schools start, are measures built in that allow them to be identified for success in making progress towards the standards if they start out far below.

Superintendent Erquiaga asked if there has been discussion about data related to how long a student remains served versus transitioning out. Statute now requires the NDE collect information about long-term EL students. Has length of time come up?

Mr. Wilson said yes, however there have not been a lot of students exiting the program in early years because they have not developed sufficient language to exit. Also, there is a problem in the middle and high school level because some EL students become stuck at the middle levels of proficiency.

President Wynn suggested it is not just zoom schools that have a transiency issue. It could be acknowledged that transiency itself is a problem with many of our schools. She commented it would be of interest to know whether EL students are becoming stuck in the middle of proficiency because they still have language barriers, or is the way they are being taught different in the higher grades. She added that including backup work and information used for making decisions about recommendations would be helpful and provide insight for the Board.

Member Serafin asked if there is a baseline for children who enter EL programs and how long they are in the program. When she worked in Houston as a teacher they analyzed how long a student was in an EL program. A plan was implemented beginning in elementary school to ensure that if a child was in a program for three years, then a team would meet to discuss the needs of the child. She asked if Nevada is working on a similar strategy for an exit plan.

Mr. Wilson responded they are in the process of gathering data to determine at what proficiency students enter, how quickly they develop proficiency and triggers of where to be concerned with students who are not achieving proficiency in an expected timeline. He said that data would be shared with the board when it becomes available. Mr. Wilson said the EMC has been discussing that issue and they are scheduled to come back to the Board in October or November with an update. At a recent meeting the Board requested they gather research about the decisions they have been making, and that would be included as be part of the update.

Member Serafin said in addition to analyzing the timelines of children in EL programs, she would like to know if trends can be defined specifically for schools that have a high percentage of EL students that are successful in exiting EL programs. In addition what is the percentage of TESL certified teachers at those schools. Member Wakefield added he would like to know if some of the schools have teacher vacancy issues. Member Serafin said she would like to know the cost per student for all of the zoom work this year.

Member Jamin recognized family engagement is important especially with students that have English as their second language and asked if schools are able to come up with supplementary funds and what family engagement activities are currently being conducted.

Superintendent Erquiaga stated the Legislature dug into spending in the prior biennium on zoom schools and addressed family engagement. Title I funding has been used at these schools for parent and family engagement. Also, for professional development with some federal Title money, the Legislative committee and their finance staff asked WCSD and CCSD questions about how much has been spent, totaled the percentage and set that in the law. That figure represents prior year spending and cordons off the state dollars, but there are other dollars available. We will report back how much was actually spent.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding the requirements of Senate Bill 511 of the 78th Regular Legislative Session. S.B. 511 requires that the Board approve the distribution of money to the boards of trustees of local school districts to provide financial incentives to new hired teachers in certain schools. The Board will receive information concerning school district programs prepared pursuant to NRS 391.168 and may allocate funds based on applications from some or all school districts in accordance with those plans.

Deputy Durish reminded the Board at the last meeting they were presented with each districts initial proposal for the S.B 511 funds. Ten districts submitted initial requests, and those districts will receive their funds soon. Four districts requested an extension in the process, and their requests have since been submitted for approval:

- White Pine and Nye County submitted plans and their recommended allocations were calculated based on \$4,000 per teacher. Board approval is recommended

- Esmeralda and Mineral County are waiting for final program approval. It is recommended the Board approve but their funds would not be released until the completed plans were received.

Member Serafin moved to approve the distribution of money to the board of trustees of White Pine, Nye, Esmeralda and Mineral County School District. Member Wakefield seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding revisions to Nevada's Parent Involvement policy pursuant to NRS 392.457. The Board will hear a brief presentation and review state policy recommendations from the Advisory Council on Parental Involvement and Family Engagement.

Deputy Durish reviewed NRS related to the Parent Involvement and Family Engagement (PIFE) Advisory Council and conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation. The PIPE council was established in 2007 and the office was added to the NDE in 2012. The Advisory Council recently reviewed the existing policy which was last reviewed by the Board in 2001

Danette Corrales, Advisory Council, said the major differences in the existing policy are that it is aligned with the current PTA language. Active verbs were added to the policy language to assure the state is in line with the process.

President Wynn inquired if the PTA language is consistent with what districts are doing and whether they agree this is the best standard for all 17 districts. Ms. Corrales responded, for the most part, they are consistent. Some policies are broader, some are narrow, but by and large, this is inclusive of work being done at the district level. President Wynn commented for this policy to be effective it must filter down to the grass roots of parents and families. Otherwise it is just a piece of paper. Ms. Corrales said the office reaches out to the family engagement coordinators in each district on a regular basis. Dialog is continuing and being enhanced.

Deputy Durish explained the intent moving forward includes: *review any effective practices carried out in individual school districts to increase parental involvement and determine the feasibility of carrying out those practices on a statewide basis.* The first step was to update the policy, then review the practices and *identify the matter in which the level of parental involvement family engagement affects the performance, attendance and discipline of students.* The intent is for this to be the launching step and then move forward. Ms. Corrales stressed the importance of inviting all districts through the cycle and then present to the Parent Involvement Advisory Council what they are doing within the districts to ensure implementation at the school level.

Member Serafin moved to approve the policy. Member Newburn seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding the procedure for conducting a hearing for a school official submitting an appeal to the State Board of Education claiming reprisal or retaliatory action taken in response to a disclosure of information concerning an irregularity in testing administration.

Nevada Revised Statutes 391.624 declares it to be the policy of this state that a school official is encouraged to disclose, to the extent not expressly prohibited by law, irregularities in testing administration and testing security, and it is the intent of the Legislature to protect the rights of a school official who makes such a disclosure. The State Board must adopt rules of procedure for conducting a hearing as requested by a school official.

Deputy Canavero provided an overview of the procedures for a state school official to disclose irregularities in testing administration and security and to protect the rights of a school official who makes such a disclosure. This is about protecting the integrity of assessments and affording teachers and administrators with due process protections to ensure they are comfortable reporting test irregularities without fear of retaliatory actions.

The State Board must adopt rules of procedure for conducting a hearing requested by a school official. Deputy Attorney General Greg Ott suggested the procedures follow those procedures related to the suspension of a teacher's license. He provided guidelines for the Board to consideration.

Deputy Canavero explained if the Board conducts a hearing and a determination is made that retaliatory action occurred, the extent of the Board's authority is to direct the proper person to desist and refrain in such action. Deputy Canavero addressed questions from Board members. The meetings must adhere to the Open Meeting Law, unless requested to be closed, and will be recorded. A notice to move forward with the hearing is not required but recommended to be between 10 and 20 calendar days. Also, it is not required but recommended the names are included along with the allegation of retaliation on the agenda. It is also recommended the Board determine the time duration of the hearing.

President Wynn suggested the Board would like to see prescriptive language, and requested proper language reflected with today's additional comments to review.

Member Cook said in American jurisprudence, accusers have always had the right to face their accusers. What does it mean if the informant is not required to come forward? Deputy Greg Ott responded these proceedings are quasi-judicial because it is not of criminal nature and it is a fact finding mission. There will be one person who feels they have been retaliated against asking for the Board to make a finding that the retaliation has in fact occurred. That retaliation may have come from another individual or entity. The procedures contemplate giving that other entity notice to come forward and defend themselves against the allegation that is being brought forth. The person who feels they have been retaliated against would also have notice to come forward and present their case. Both parties would have the opportunity to show up and defend themselves.

Member Cook asked about a situation where someone has provided information that another education professional has manipulated the testing process and in turn that person is accusing the original informant of a vindictive act. Deputy Attorney Ott responded the procedure this has designed is not necessarily for someone who has been manipulating tests. It is for someone who believes they have reported an irregularity and something wrong occurred. And then some kind of retaliation taken against them, they have been assigned different classes or they have been transferred unfairly and feel as though they have been persecuted for being a whistle blower.

They would identify the person who brought that wrong against them and that person would be given an opportunity. An actual testing irregularity would be investigated by the NDE and would not come before the Board. Member Cook confirmed this about a general whistle blowing protection. Deputy Ott concurred.

Member Melcher expressed concern regarding the person who felt retaliation action was taken against them for being a whistle blower, that person may feel persecuted again having to go through it again in an open meeting in public. He asked to look at that further and added the shorter time period would be good to allow the situation to be resolved and get back on track. Deputy Ott agreed to look at closing the meeting before it is brought back to the Board and agreed the concern about the time frame and keeping it short is in line with the NDE recommendation.

Member Jensen seconded member Melchers comments. If a closed session is held and where character and competence is considered, then statutorily the meeting could be closed and should be closed. A second concern is the document references *the employer* and in a whistle blower situation often times it may not be an employer, but rather a co-worker. Earlier in the document the term used is *entity* or *school official*. He asked if the word *employer* is appropriate. Deputy Canavero responded that is an error and is should be *entity* or *school official*.

Deputy Ott said he had enough information to re-draft the hearing procedures and will bring it back to the October meeting.

Future Agenda Items

President Wynn confirmed the Board would like ongoing testing information updates. Teacher recruitment will also be brought back to the October meeting.

Member Serafin requested that the CCSD HR report that is coming to the Board in October is not just about full time hires, but also the substitute count. In addition, she requested the opportunity to focus on schools that are part of the Governor's agenda keeping the Board updated about the achievement district.

Member Wakefield said there has been mention of the Nevada Plan in alignment with EL and also modernizing the Nevada Plan and asked for an item to understand the role of the Board. He requested an item to understand the work on the university side of scholarships related to S.B. 511.

President Wynn explained that she will to defer to the staff to keep the Board on track in a timely way and deal with member's likes and wishes as they fall into place. If we do not get to everything, we keep it on the to-do list until it becomes a must do list.

Public Comment #2

Ben Gerhardt, testing coordinator, Nevada Virtual Academy said currently there are still no SBAC results to analyze and 90 percent of his students participated in SBAC. It is disappointing as parents and teachers who are calling to ask where are the SBAC scores and what is going on? He has put them off advising only test data and grades from last year are available. He said he knows it is not the fault of the Board or superintendent but the sooner the scores come in the

better. Also, now that the entire state is using the ACT, he asked if ACT representatives could come and discuss with the districts and schools at a deeper level digging into data and not just looking at the case level composite scores and bench marks. Over summer staff participated in the WorkKeys and they were amazed at the results. He suggested it would be worthwhile to explore them further

Member Jensen said on behalf of NASS, he expressed appreciation to Superintendent Erquiaga stating it has been a pleasure working with him the past two years and thanked him for all he has done.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m.